



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,513	11/28/2001	Johan Nilsson	0119-155	3520
42015 7590 02/12/2007 POTOMAC PATENT GROUP, PLLC P. O. BOX 270 FREDERICKSBURG, VA 22404			EXAMINER KUMAR, PANKAJ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/12/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/996,513	Applicant(s) NILSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Pankaj Kumar	Art Unit 2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

4. In regards to claims 1-14, the claims disclose a process (method) that manipulates only number, abstract concepts or ideas or representing any of the foregoing, the claims are not being applied to an appropriate subject matter. (See MPEP 2106 and Interim Guidelines)

5. From MPEP 2106: "The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. The purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of "real world" value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting point for future investigation or research (Brenner v. Manson, 383 U.S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96); In re Ziegler, 992, F.2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993))."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-14 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either an asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aschwanden USPN 5,999,802.

10. As per claim 1, Aschwanden teaches deriving a first set of channel estimates from symbols received through a first channel (Aschwanden fig. 5: GC); deriving a second set of channel estimates from symbols received through a second channel (Aschwanden fig. 5: PC); determining the gain offset based on the first and second sets of channel estimates (Aschwanden col. 4 lines 17-19: “gain ... of two channels are unequal and change ...”) wherein each of the

Art Unit: 2611

channel estimates is a model of one of the first and second channels and includes one or more channel tap coefficients (Aschwanden fig. 5: filter coefficient for both GC and PC).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 2, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aschwanden USPN 5,999,802 in view of Choi.

13. As per claim 2, Aschwanden teaches claim 1 but does not teach pilot channels. Choi teaches pilot channels (Choi fig. 1: 101, 111; col. 2 lines 15-20). Thus, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at time the invention was made, to arrive at the pilot channels as recited by the instant claims, because the combined teaching of Aschwanden with Choi suggest pilot channels as recited by the instant claims. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art, would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Choi with Aschwanden because Aschwanden suggests data (something broad) in general and Choi suggests the beneficial use of data being pilot channels (such as pilot channels being all 1's (Choi col. 2 line 21) and then scrambling pilot channels in order to indicate the base station (Choi col. 2 lines 18-35) so that the receiver can know the strength from each base station and adjust weights accordingly (Choi col. 1 lines 47-52) for better reception in the analogous art of communication system.

Art Unit: 2611

14. As per claim 3, Aschwanden teaches claim 1 but does not teach where the channels are DPCH and CPICH. Choi teaches that the channels are DPCH and CPICH (Choi col. 2 lines 10-15: CPICH; col. 15 lines 4-17: recovering CPICH in one line or channel and DPCH in another line or channel in conjunction with fig. 10: 1003, 1005, 1007). Thus, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at time the invention was made, to arrive at the DPCH and CPICH as recited by the instant claims, because the combined teaching of Aschwanden with Choi suggest DPCH and CPICH as recited by the instant claims. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art, would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Choi with Aschwanden because Aschwanden suggests channels (something broad) in general and Choi suggests the beneficial use of channels being DPCH and CPICH (such as using the DPCH as a paging channel (as DPCH stands for data paging channel) in order to page an end unit in order to verify the possibility of communication and using the CPICH as a channel estimator (Choi col. 15 lines 18-30))) in the analogous art of communication system.

Art Unit: 2611

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pankaj Kumar whose telephone number is (571) 272-3011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

16. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

17. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Pankaj Kumar
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2611

PK